









United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | NG DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 09/777,274 | 02, | /05/2001 | Jean Paul Marcade | ENDOV-54735 | ENDOV-54735 3685 | | |
| 24201 | 7590 | 03/25/2003 | | | | | |
| | | LEE & UTEC | EXAM | EXAMINER | | | |
| 6060 CENT | HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE | | | | WILLSE, DAVID H | | |
| TENTH FLO | | 0045 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | , | | | 3738 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application N . | Applicant(s) | Mur | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/777,274 | MARCADE ET AL. | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Dave Willse | 3738 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence addre | ess | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED March 13, 2003, FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Se | e MPEP | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | e fee. The appropriate exter the final Office action; or (2 | nsion fee under 2) as set forth in | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note | • ' | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | tion(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | I be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely filed | amendment | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | | sidered but does NO | T place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were | e newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w | | | and an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disap | proved by the Exami | ner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | · | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | Dave Willse | ○ | | | | |
| | | Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3738 | | | | | |

Continuati n Sheet (PTO-303) 09/777,274

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Applicant admits that the term "juxtaposed" is used by Goicoechea et al. to mean "side-by-side" (page 3, lines 8-10 of Paper No. 19), which is the plain and ordinary meaning of the term used by the examiner and which is illustrated in Figure 4A for juxtaposed apices of hoops (20). The term "overlapping" means "[t]o have an area or range in common with: coincide partly with" (Webster's New Riverside University Dictionary, 1984), so the Applicant's conclusion that the secured apices are "not overlapping" is dubious. Juxtaposed tubular members as disclosed by Goicoechea et al. involve an outer surface positioned side-by-side with an inner surface, and thus "overlapping" is deemed to be an apt description.